



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

✓

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,380	04/12/2004	Jun-Sang Park	678-1323 (P11450)	2848
28249	7590	09/09/2005	EXAMINER	
DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 333 EARLE OVINGTON BLVD. UNIONDALE, NY 11553			BROUSSARD, COREY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/822,380	PARK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Corey M. Broussard	2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ozaki et al. (EP 1,207,671). With respect to claim 1, Ozaki teaches a portable swing-type digital communication device comprising: a body housing (2); a swing housing (1) rotatably attached to the body housing by means of a hinge module (7), the swing housing rotatable about a hinge axis at a prescribed angle perpendicular to the top surface of the body housing (see Fig. 2A), the swing housing being disposed at a prescribed angle to a planar surface of the body housing when the swing housing is rotated to a prescribed angle from the body housing; and a step compensating mechanism (2a) for preventing a step between the top surface of the body housing and the top surface of the swing housing when the swing housing is rotated to the prescribed angle from the body housing.

3. With respect to claim 3, Ozaki teaches wherein the swing housing (1) has a speaker unit (4), a display unit (3), and a key array (8) arranged on the top surface thereof, the display unit being disposed adjacent to the speaker unit, the key array

comprising at least one key disposed adjacent to the display unit (see col 3, lines 46-48, Fig. 1A).

4. With respect to claim 9, Ozaki teaches wherein a key array (8) on the top surface of the swing housing (1, see Fig. 1A) is closest to a first key array (5), and a speaker unit (4) is farthest from a microphone unit (6) when the swing housing is rotated to an angle of approximately 180 degrees from the body housing (see Fig. 6B).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki et al. (EP 1,207,671) in view of Kuroda (US Pub 2004/0048632) and Pallakoff (US Pub 2002/0163504). With respect to claim 2, Ozaki teaches the device as applied to claim 1 above, and wherein the body housing comprises: a first key array (5) and a microphone unit (6) arranged on the top surface thereof, the first key array having a plurality of keys, the microphone unit being disposed adjacent to the first key array (see col 3, lines 44-46). Ozaki lacks the specific teaching of a second key array, camera lens, and lighting unit. Pallakoff teaches a portable digital communication device (100) with a body housing having a second key array arranged on one of the side surfaces thereof, the second key array having a plurality of keys (101, 102, 103, see Fig. 1). Kuroda teaches

a portable digital communication device with a camera lens (11) and lighting unit (16) arranged on the bottom surface thereof (see Fig 3), the lighting unit being disposed adjacent to the camera lens. Kuroda lacks the specific teaching of a pair of lighting components, but it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the swing type device of Ozaki with the side buttons of Pallakoff and back camera of Kuroda to obtain a portable communication device with side buttons allowing for faster typing of text and a camera allowing the device to capture images and two lighting units allowing the camera to function in lower light conditions than just one lighting unit provides for.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/10/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant alleges that Ozaki does not prevent "a step" as recited in claim 1. However the Examiner notes that in this case "a" is used as an indefinite article and does not convey any degree or amount of step to be prevented. The Examiner asserts that the mechanism of Ozaki prevents at least some "step" and therefore the device of Ozaki falls within the scope of the claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 4-8 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The claimed combination of the semicircular section formed at one end of the swing housing with compensating member and recess as claimed is not rendered obvious over prior art. The prior art of record to Gray discloses the swing type housing with a hinge but lacks clear teaching of a recess formed for the compensating member. Note also Brandenberg et al., Kinke-Anlauff, and SanGiovanni showing the general state of the art of swing housing step compensating portable devices.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corey M. Broussard whose telephone number is 571 272 2799. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on 571 272 2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CMB
cmb


ANATOLY VORTMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER